

Date: Thu, 10 Feb 94 04:30:16 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #48
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 10 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 48

Today's Topics:

Exams are Trivial?

I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
Where were we 10-20 years ago (was Re: I just HAD to.)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 07 Feb 1994 18:00:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!news.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Exams are Trivial?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gdavis.760304719@griffin>, Gary Davis (gdavis@griffin.uvm.edu) writes:
> I've noted for some time, since the ham exams are written and administarted
> by the VEC rather than the FCC, the whole level of difficulty has shifted.

The VEC's are not at fault here. The FCC creates the questions and
it is the FCC policy to make them public knowledge.

>Now, not only can all of the questions be memorized, the entire exam
>can be passed without even knowing the most simplistic application of
>Ohm's law.

>

>I have a friend who recently passed his Advanced ticket who asked me,
>afterward to explain Ohm's law to him and also what exactly an antenna tuner

>might be good for.

I heard three hams arguing over a local repeater not long ago about how many picofarads were in a microfarad. At least one had an *Extra* class call, and opinions went all the way from a million to one, to one to a million. When I told them the answer, they seemed grateful that someone with such esoteric knowledge was willing to help out.

I also heard a new ham telling people she was using a 5-H antenna. This went on for a few days before someone corrected her.

I always thought that we had to justify our occupation of our frequencies by returning something to the commonweal, but sometimes it seems it's just a numbers game, and we're planning to hold onto our frequencies by sheer numbers of bodies.

Mike Silva, KK6GM

Date: 7 Feb 1994 19:54:06 GMT
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Enough already!! Drop the 2nd Ammendment arguements! You will *never* get everyone to agree with you, which ever way you argue.

In article <N77cHc4w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>You are wrong Jeff. That is the typical Liberal misinterpretation of
>what was written. If you review the notes of the debates prior to the
>enactment of the bill of rights, you will see the intent was to apply to
>all citizens. And the National Guard/Reserve is the REGULATED militia,
>the UNREGULATED militia is all able bodied males between 18 and 35.
>(According to Mr. Webster that you quoted before.)

OK, I am definitely *not* a liberal. However, I do agree with Jeff. When the Bill of Rights was written, the militia (regulated, if you insist) meant "all men", usually with some age limits, say 18 and 35. However, during the 19th century, this definition was changed to the present National Guard. It wasn't until almost the turn of the century that our present National Guard system,

with some federal funding of state troops, finally came to be.

So you see, in the course of 200 years, the definitions have changed. Thus you must take into account the *spirit* of the law. Before the revolution, England tried to disband some of the colonies militias. *This* is what the writers of the Bill of Rights was trying to stop from ever happening.

So, you can argue either way, depending on how you interpret the wording of the Second Ammendment. That is why there is such a heated debate about it today, and will probably never be settled.

>It states we need a militia, that being necessary, the right of the
>people to keep... It does not say the right of the militia. It says
>the PEOPLE! All the people! The debates of the time CLEARLY prove
>that was the intent.

You must realize, the regulated militia *was* all the people. Therein lies the arguement today. The definitions have changed.

>Is all your reading of rules and such that much in error? Could this be
>the reason you do not fully understand the arguement against morse
>testing?

No! Him "not understanding" the arguement against morse code testing, could be the same reason you don't "understand"the arguement for it. [BTW--I am against it.] He feels differently than you because of different interpretations. Laws are generally written vaguely so not everything has to be spelled out making more paperwork.

--

Will Turner, NORDV	-----
wjturner@iastate.edu	"Are you going to have any professionalism,
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu	or am I going to have to beat it into you?"
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov	-----

Date: 08 Feb 1994 18:59:36 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!
sgiblab!sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!korie!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!
engnews1.Eng.Sun@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Where were we 10-20 years ago (was Re: I just HAD to.)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CKvCv4.KA8@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>And you're wrong - I clearly understand the code/no-code debate. What I
>don't understand is where you folks were 10 or 20 years ago (there were
>plenty of other modes back then, too); why didn't I hear anyone complaining

>back then?

Speaking for myself: because back then when I occasionally picked up a QST and looked to see what was going on, I quickly got the message that if I didn't want to spend my time sending and receiving Morse, you guys flat didn't want me in your hobby. So I gave you what you apparently wanted.

Once the logjam finally broke, the FCC and the amateur radio organizations (including, finally, even the ARRL) recognized that code requirement was hurting the hobby, the code requirement was dropped for Technicians, and I joined up.

>Luckily, those hams gathered here on usenet are only a small percentage
>of the ham community in our country and world-wide (come to think of it
>I don't recall any non-U.S. hams on here complaining about their country's
>code requirements!) so the vocal no-code group probably represents
>a tiny number of all hams.

I certainly don't see why you'd expect vocal no-codes to be grossly over-represented on USENET. As far as I can see the stats on USENET are about

- .01% Complete idiots like Robert
- .1% Vocal keep-the-code people
- 1% People who want to reorganize the US licensing system, in a way that will end up granting more priviledges for less code speed, but not necessarily with that as a primary goal
- .1% Vocal kill-the-code people
- 98.79% People who wish we allwould just shut up about this

I think this pretty well reflects the hobby as a whole.

>Vietnamese Proverb: If you study you will become what you wish
> If you do not study you will never become anything.

How true. I don't wish to become a radio operator on a cheapskate freighter ship, so I'd rather spend my time studying other things...

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Wed, 9 Feb 1994 06:44:47 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <19940207.11285980.edellers@delphi.com>, <CKvBIu.JvG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <xG6rVMw.edellers@delphi.com>ix3.

Subject : 2nd Adm.(was: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <xG6rVMw.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>Jeff Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> writes:

>
>>Ed: Finish the quote - you only supplied half of the Second Admendment; and
>>be thinking, as you study it, in what context it was written. Sheesh!
>
>I DID finish the quote. The "militia" clause -- "A well-regulated militia
>being necessary to the security of a free state,..." -- comes before the part
>I quoted, and does NOT conflict with the end of the sentence.
>
>If the framers had intended this to apply only to militias, why did they
>say "the right of the people to keep and bear arms?"

Read the fine article Will Turner wrote a few articles back - that will
answer your question.

Let's see, I'd better say something about radios so I don't get told to
go to alt.2nd.admendment.

Will the FCC grant you a callsign out of your district? Do you have to
reside in that district to get a call from there? Or have a mailing
address from there? I'll see what kind of answers you folks supply
before I call our FCC office here. I'm looking for a KH#xx call
since the KH6xx ran out a loooong time ago. I don't like calls
starting with N - I feel like a naval radio station (at one time
the only U.S. calls starting with N were Navy and Coast Guard
radio facilities, and calls starting with A were Army and Air
force units). Phooey.

73s, Gang. [Oh no! He pluralized 73!]

=====

Jeffrey NH6IL jherman@hawaii.edu, who, in his spare time, cannibalizes
old TV sets to make QRP transmitters (CW, of course).

Previously: WA6QIJ, WH6AEQ, NMO (U.S. Coast Guard Radio Honolulu: 500 kc CW)

Vietnamese Proverb: If you study you will become what you wish
If you do not study you will never become anything.

=====

Date: Tue, 8 Feb 1994 17:24:15 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <10@ted.win.net>, <1994Feb7.173011.5041@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1994Feb7.212008.12116@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: I just HAD to. Really: Goodwill, contesting and DXing

In article <1994Feb7.212008.12116@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>

>Far and away, however, the most important factor is that Contesting and DXing
>are simply the best emergency communications trainers available. In order
>to really use HF in an emergency, you need a well worn set of basic skills,
>including a knowledge of propagation and operating practices (pileup
>management and fast logging) that are required for successful Contest/DX
>operation.

Competitive, *contentless* contacts are not "the best emergency communications trainers available". Emergency communications requires *cooperation* and accurate relay of *content*, neither of which are encouraged by contesting and DXing. If you want message handling training, participate in a *traffic* net. It's true that knowledge of HF propagation is often gained by DXers, though more and more just seem to wait for the Packetcluster to give them a spot and then pile on, but it's the operating practices fostered by contesting and DXing that are the most *damaging* if applied to the operation of emergency communications networks. There's no place for competition in emergency communications.

>I'm beginning to get the distinct impression that you don't spend much time
>on HF. In the past, you've repeatedly proclaimed that those who operate on
>the low end of the bands are merely a bunch of old coots (it's about 50-50
>these days, given the influx of QRP enthusiasts, who tend to be much younger),
>and now you're crusading against contesting and DXing. What gives?

I certainly don't spend as much time on HF as I did 25 years ago. Today my activities are fairly well limited to some RTTY activity, I have a separate RTTY station, meeting a couple of traffic nets, and the occasional trolling for an interesting person with which to converse. There are RTTY contests, but there are also still a lot more people who wish to carry on meaningful conversations via the green keys. The nets are orderly and cooperative. And I occasionally get lucky and find a random contact with someone whose primary interest isn't postal card collecting. I spend the majority of my operating time on VHF/UHF/SHF and satellites. The ruthless competition and contentless contacts so often seen on HF aren't quite as bad up there yet, except on a couple of contest weekends per year when all the postal card chasers seem to come out of the woodwork, bringing

all their bad habits with them.

What gives? Perhaps I've grown up over the last 30 years of hamming. I've come to believe that ideas are more important than scores, and that conversation is of more value than repetitively screaming the same exchange into a microphone while cranking up the amp, and the blood pressure, another notch.

Note: in a vain attempt to forestall flames, let me say that I'm sure there's a considerate contester out there somewhere, and that there's probably a DXer lurking somewhere who doesn't give meaningless 599 signal reports while asking for repeats on the other fellow's call, location, and name. It's just that I rarely hear him. It seems to me that the most active DXer has the callsign of UP5LID. I hear him a lot. (For the benefit of the clueless, that's an attempt at humor.)

Gary

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way           | Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244   |                   |
```

Date: Tue, 8 Feb 94 13:36:24 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.Brown.EDU!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CKM3tJ.FEs@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <19940207.11285980.edellers@delphi.com>, <CKvBIu.JvG@news.Hawaii.Edu>i.co
Subject : Re: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

Jeff Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> writes:

>Ed: Finish the quote - you only supplied half of the Second Admendent; and
>be thinking, as you study it, in what context it was written. Sheesh!

I DID finish the quote. The "militia" clause -- "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state,..." -- comes before the part I quoted, and does NOT conflict with the end of the sentence.

If the framers had intended this to apply only to militias, why did they say "the right of the people to keep and bear arms?"

Date: 7 Feb 1994 19:58:14 GMT

From: nntp.ucsbl.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!

wjturner@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CKtKvE.M1@world.std.com>, <19940207.11400585.edellers@delphi.com>,
<CKvAqM.IsD@world.std.com>

Subject : Re: Operating in Canada?

In article <CKvAqM.IsD@world.std.com> drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>I'm sorry. I missed your citation showing that Part 97 applies to any

>operator, US national or otherwise, of any station located in Canada.

>I asked for one mere lines after you ended your quote.

>Do you have one?

It doesn't apply to *any* operator, only *US* hams. [If you want the exact
paragraph send me a private e-mail message. There is no reason to waste mor
bandwidth.]

--

Will Turner, NORDV

wjturner@iastate.edu

twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu

TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov

| "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
or am I going to have to beat it into you?"

Date: Mon, 7 Feb 1994 19:37:36 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!wa4mei.ping.com!
ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <06FEB94.12030322.0075@UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA>, <CKtKvE.M1@world.std.com>,
<19940207.11400585.edellers@delphi.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Operating in Canada?

In article <19940207.11400585.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
writes:

>David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

>

>>1. The FCC has no jurisdiction over amateur stations located in

>>Canada, or the operators of those stations. If the Canadian

>>government gives Generals the "Advanced + 12" privileges, that's their

>>business. [If the Canadian government wanted to give those same

>>privileges to anyone possessing a valid US passport regardless of

>>whether a licence is held in the US, they could do that too!]

>

>They sure as hell DO, once those U.S. licensed operators return to the U.S.
>If you break a U.S. Federal law while abroad you CAN be punished upon your
>return.

It's worse than that. Just ask the former President of Panama if the US can invade a sovereign nation, kidnap you, bring you to the US in chains, imprison you for long periods, and try you for supposedly violating US domestic law, even if you never enter the US voluntarily. Or ask the Mexican doctor kidnapped by US agents and smuggled into this country for trial on charges for acts supposedly committed in Mexico. The US has all but abandoned any pretense of honoring international law, or the sovereignty of other nations. That shouldn't surprise anyone who knows how the US Government has been assualting and killing it's own citizens with DEA, BATF, and FBI death squads.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #48
